UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/721,602	11/25/2003	Pawan Goyal	ARC920030077US1	5994
JOSEPH P. CU	7590 05/12/200 RTIN, L <sub>4</sub> L <sub>4</sub> C,	EXAMINER		
1469 N.W. MO	RGAN LANE	DAYE, CHELCIE L		
PORTLAND, (	JK 97229-3291		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2161	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/12/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary		Applicat	ion No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/721,6	302	GOYAL, PAWAN	GOYAL, PAWAN			
		Examine	r	Art Unit				
		CHELCII	E DAYE	2161				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communic or Reply	ation appears on tl	ne cover sheet with	the correspondence ac	ldress			
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MA INDICATE IN THE MAIN IN T	ILING DATE OF T 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no e ication. tory period will apply and II, by statute, cause the ap	THIS COMMUNICA event, however, may a repl will expire SIX (6) MONTH oplication to become ABAN	ATION. y be timely filed IS from the mailing date of this of IDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed	on 28 February 2	208					
,	•	)⊠ This action is						
3)		<i>'</i> —		s, prosecution as to the	e merits is			
٠,١	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	on of Claims		•					
- 4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-20 22-24 and 26 is/are pen	ding in the applica	ution					
•	Claim(s) <u>1-20,22-24 and 26</u> is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
′=	Claim(s) <u>1-20,22-24 and 26</u> is/are reje	cted						
·	Claim(s) is/are objected to.	otou.						
•	Claim(s) are subject to restriction	on and/or election	requirement.					
	on Papers							
-	The specification is objected to by the		\ <i>.</i>					
10)	10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the	-	<u> </u>	•	, ,			
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>								
2)  Notic 3) Inform	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTonation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	D-948)	Paper No(s)/N	nmary (PTO-413) Mail Date rmal Patent Application				

Art Unit: 2161

## **DETAILED ACTION**

This action is issued in response to applicant's Appeal Brief filed February 28,
 2008.

- 2. Claims 1-20,22-24,and 26 are presented. No claims added and claims 21 and 25 remain cancelled.
- 3. Claims 1-20,22-24,and 26 are pending.
- 4. In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 2/28/08, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A new ground of rejection is set forth below. If an appellant wishes to reinstate an appeal after prosecution is reopened, appellant must file a new notice of appeal in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31and a complete new appeal brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37. Any previously paid appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 for filing a notice of appeal, filing an appeal brief, and requesting an oral hearing (if applicable) will be applied to the new appeal on the same application as long as a final Board decision has not been made on the prior appeal. If, however, the appeal fees have increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the current fee(s) and the amount previously paid. Appellant must file a complete new appeal brief in compliance with the format and content requirements of 37 CFR 41.37(c) within two months from the date of filing the new notice of appeal. See MPEP § 1205.

Art Unit: 2161

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 1,4-7,10,13-15,18-20,24, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yanai (US Patent No. 6,502,205) filed November 10, 2000, in view of Kawamura (US Patent Application No. 20040193658) filed August 29, 2003.

Regarding Claims 1, 7, 10, 15, and 20, Yanai discloses a method for asynchronously remotely copying database content changes from a primary site to a remote site, the method comprising:

associating a sequential identification with each respective log record write and each corresponding data record write received at the primary site, each data record write containing modifications to a page of the database and each log record write containing information describing modifications to the page of the database for a corresponding data record write (column 32, lines 34-58 and column 33, lines 7-10, Yanai). However, Yanai is silent with respect to asynchronously remotely copying each respective log record write from the primary site to the remote site; receiving an acknowledgement at the primary site, the acknowledgement corresponding to a log record write that has been

Art Unit: 2161

completed at the remote site; and asynchronously remotely copying each data record write having a sequential identification that is prior to or equal to the sequential identification of the log record write corresponding to the received acknowledgement. On the other hand, Kawamura discloses asynchronously remotely copying each respective log record write from the primary site to the remote site ([0016] and [0054], lines 13-18, Kawamura); receiving an acknowledgement at the primary site, the acknowledgement corresponding to a log record write that has been completed at the remote site ([0073], Kawamura); and asynchronously remotely copying each data record write having a sequential identification that is only prior to or equal to the sequential identification of the log record write corresponding to the received acknowledgement ([0075], lines 1-3 and [0076-0077], Kawamura). Yanai and Kawamura are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of asynchronous remote copying. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Kawamura's teachings into the Yanai system. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine in order to provide a system in which modification contents of information completed within a primary site are lost in a remote site is lower in response of a failure or predetermined condition. Thus, allowing for a more efficient and non-disruptive asynchronous copy system.

Art Unit: 2161

Regarding Claims 4, 13, 18, and 24, the combination of Yanai in view of Kawamura, disclose the method wherein a log record write is asynchronously remotely copied from the primary site to the remote site before a data record write is asynchronously remotely copied from the primary site to the remote site (column 32, lines 34-38, Yanai).

Regarding Claims 5, 14, 19, and 26, the combination of Yanai in view of Kawamura, disclose the method wherein each log record write is a log block ([0050], lines 1-6, Kawamura) and each data record write is a data block write ([0048], lines 5-7, Kawamura).

Regarding Claim 6, the combination of Yanai in view of Kawamura, disclose the method further comprising:

asynchronously receiving a log record write at the remote site ([0016] and [0054], lines 13-18, Kawamura);

storing the received log record write at the remote site ([0062], Kawamura);

sending an acknowledgement from the remote site to the primary site when the received log record write is complete ([0073], Kawamura);

asynchronously receiving a data record write at the remote site from the primary site ([0075], lines 1-3 and [0076-0077], Kawamura); and storing the received data record write ([0062], Kawamura).

Art Unit: 2161

7. Claims 2-3,8-9,11-12,16-17, and 22-23, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yanai (US Patent No. 6,502,205) filed November 10, 2000, in view of Kawamura (US Patent Application No. 20040193658) filed August 29, 2003, and further in view of Shomler (US Patent No. 5,623,599) filed July 29, 1994.

Regarding Claims 2, 8, 11, 16, and 22, the combination of Yanai in view of Kawamura disclose all of the claimed subject matter as stated above. However, while the combination of Yanai in view of Kawamura, teach a sequential identification, they are not as detailed with the being a monotonically increasing identification number. On the other hand, Shomler discloses a monotonically increasing identification number (column 11, lines 38-46, Shomler). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Shomler's teachings into the Yanai and Kawamura system. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine in order to allow for the identification to be more precise and consistent with the information being produced by the system.

Regarding Claims 3, 9, 12, 17, and 23, the combination of Yanai in view of Kawamura, and further in view of Shomler, disclose the method wherein the sequential identification is a monotonically increasing time-stamp identification (column 7, lines 43-60, Shomler).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot

in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

**Points of Contact** 

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to CHELCIE DAYE whose telephone number is (571)272-

3891. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Apu Mofiz can be reached on 571-272-4146080. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chelcie Daye

Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100

May 8, 2008

Art Unit: 2161

/Apu M Mofiz/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2161